

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Alfredo Gonzalez	Team: Squad #3	CCRB Case #: 201704633	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Force	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Wednesday, 06/07/2017 9:30 PM	Location of Incident: East 109th Street and 1st Avenue	Precinct: 23	18 Mo. SOL 12/7/2018	EO SOL 12/7/2018	
Date/Time CV Reported Fri, 06/09/2017 8:15 AM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: Call Processing System	Date/Time Received at CCRB Fri, 06/09/2017 8:15 AM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address

Witness(es)	Home Address

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. POM Matthew Vantress	14994	946358	023 PCT
2. POM Anthony Lorusso	07410	960833	023 PCT
3. POM Jonathan Perez	17154	951041	023 PCT
4. POM Michael Laborde	05867	954037	023 PCT

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. SGT Jonathan Hom	4803	940269	023 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.POM Matthew Vantress	Force: Police Officer Matthew Vantress used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	
B.POM Anthony Lorusso	Force: Police Officer Anthony Lorusso used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	
C.POM Matthew Vantress	Force: Police Officer Matthew Vantress used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	
D.POM Matthew Vantress	Discourtesy: Police Officer Matthew Vantress spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)	
E.POM Jonathan Perez	Force: Police Officer Jonathan Perez used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	
F.POM Michael Laborde	Force: Police Officer Michael Laborde used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	
G.POM Matthew Vantress	Force: Police Officer Matthew Vantress used a Taser against § 87(2)(b)	
H.POM Matthew Vantress	Force: Police Officer Matthew Vantress used a Taser against § 87(2)(b)	
I.POM Jonathan Perez	Force: Police Officer Jonathan Perez used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)		

Case Summary

§ 87(2)(b) filed this complaint with the CCRB on behalf of himself and his brother, § 87(2)(b) via the Call Processing System, on June 9, 2017.

On June 7, 2017, at approximately 9:30 p.m., § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) responded to the vicinity of East 109th Street and 1st Avenue in Manhattan after having been informed that § 87(2)(b)'s daughter had been struck by a vehicle while crossing the street. Upon arrival, § 87(2)(b) observed PO Matthew Vantress and PO Anthony Lorusso of the 23rd Precinct at the location, as well as two ambulances. § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) approached the officers and asked them if they could direct them to § 87(2)(b)'s daughter. PO Vantress told § 87(2)(b) that he did not know where she was and allegedly began pulling and pushing § 87(2)(b) to the sidewalk with PO Lorusso's assistance (**Allegation A: Force**, § 87(2)(g) and **Allegation B: Force**, § 87(2)(g)). PO Vantress also allegedly pushed § 87(2)(b) twice (**Allegation C: Force**, § 87(2)(g)). During the course of their interaction, PO Vantress allegedly told § 87(2)(b) to "shut the fuck up" multiple times, commanded him to get on the "fucking" sidewalk, to put his "fucking" hands behind his back, stated, "Did you hear what I fucking said," and called him a "motherfucker" (**Allegation D: Discourtesy**, § 87(2)(g)). § 87(2)(b) eventually went to his daughter inside the ambulance while PO Vantress and PO Lorusso held onto § 87(2)(b) and attempted to get him onto the sidewalk. At some point during the struggle, PO Vantress removed his Taser and requested additional units. PO Jonathan Perez, Sgt. Jonathan Hom, and PO Michael Laborde of the 23rd Precinct arrived to the location and PO Perez and PO Laborde assisted in trying to handcuff § 87(2)(b) but they were unable to do so (**Allegation E: Force**, § 87(2)(g) and **Allegation F: Force**, § 87(2)(g)). Afterward, PO Vantress deployed his Taser against § 87(2)(b) two times (**Allegation G: Force**, § 87(2)(g) and **Allegation H: Force**, § 87(2)(g)). While on the ground, PO Perez allegedly placed his foot on § 87(2)(b)'s back to hold him down on the ground (**Allegation I: Force**, § 87(2)(g), § 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)).

§ 87(2)(b) was arrested for § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) was arrested for § 87(2)(b) (BR 01). § 87(2)(b) was transported to § 87(2)(b) for the removal of the Taser prongs.

§ 87(2)(b) provided partial cellphone footage that captured PO Vantress holding onto § 87(2)(b) and officers attempting to place § 87(2)(b) in handcuffs (BR 02).

Findings and Recommendations

Allegation A – Force: Police Officer Matthew Vantress used physical force against § 87(2)(b)

Allegation B – Force: Police Officer Anthony Lorusso used physical force against § 87(2)(b)

Allegation C – Force: Police Officer Matthew Vantress used physical force against § 87(2)(b)

It is undisputed that PO Vantress and PO Lorusso used physical force against § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b) stated that he approached PO Vantress and asked for the whereabouts of his niece, to which PO Vantress responded, "I don't know," and then grabbed him by the arm and attempted to push and pull him onto the sidewalk. § 87(2)(b) asked PO Vantress why he was touching him and told him he would comply after making sure his niece was okay. PO Vantress was unresponsive and continued to push him towards the sidewalk by his arm. Eventually, PO Vantress "backed" § 87(2)(b) into the hood of a vehicle by "pulling, grabbing," and "pushing" him with one hand, which prompted § 87(2)(b) to state, "What the fuck are you doing? Don't touch me. You don't need to touch me. I'm making sure my nieces are okay." § 87(2)(b) denied resisting, but acknowledged that he kept his hands up and did not go to the sidewalk. PO Lorusso then came and assisted PO Vantress in holding § 87(2)(b) against the vehicle. § 87(2)(b) emphasized that he remained "cool" and "calm" and that his hands were up. Eventually, PO Vantress stated, "Put your hands behind your back," but § 87(2)(b) did not comply and continued keeping his hands up. § 87(2)(b) was unable to specify where the officers were grabbing him, and only stated that the officers were "on [him]."

§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(b) stated that after they approached PO Vantress, § 87(2)(b) asked him about the whereabouts of his daughter and asked who hit his daughter approximately three times. Immediately after, PO Vantress pushed § 87(2)(b) in the chest/shoulder area and commanded him to move back and to move to the sidewalk. § 87(2)(b) told PO Vantress not to touch him and asked again for his daughter's whereabouts, after which PO Vantress pushed him the same area again and issued him the same commands. An individual in the crowd then pointed out the ambulance that contained § 87(2)(b)'s daughter and § 87(2)(b) went to it and entered. While inside the ambulance, PO Vantress and PO Lorusso took hold of § 87(2)(b) and commanded him to go to the sidewalk and pushed him towards the parked vehicles.

§ 87(2)(b) the driver of the vehicle that struck the two girls, stated that he was explaining the incident to PO Vantress when two black males arrived to the scene, one of whom (identified by the investigation as § 87(2)(b) started yelling aggressively and asked, "Who hit my girl?" § 87(2)(b) also stated, "I want to kill him," and, "I want to hit him." § 87(2)(b)'s behavior frightened § 87(2)(b) so he ran to his vehicle and locked himself inside. § 87(2)(b) also recalled that PO Vantress asked § 87(2)(b) to keep off the street three times, but he did not listen. § 87(2)(b) was unable to provide any details regarding § 87(2)(b)'s behavior, and he only noted that § 87(2)(b) was "backing up" his brother. § 87(2)(b) estimated that PO Vantress spent two to three minutes attempting to calm down the males before telling them to stay off the street. § 87(2)(b) did not observe PO Vantress push any of the males, and he added that he did not see PO Vantress do "anything to them," except hold one of the males (BR 07).

§ 87(2)(b) a witness to the vehicle accident, stated in her phone statement that she observed § 87(2)(b) arrive to the scene claiming to be the father of the girl who was struck by the car and was asking "who knocked down [his] daughter." § 87(2)(b) noted that § 87(2)(b) seemed, based on the tone of his voice, to be becoming "belligerent" and she believed that it "was not going to end nicely." § 87(2)(b) noted that she did not hear § 87(2)(b) state anything regarding the welfare of his child and that he seemed to be more concerned about finding the individual that had struck her. § 87(2)(b) also noted that the two officers at the scene told § 87(2)(b) to calm down several times, but he did not comply and began to shout louder. § 87(2)(b) also got the sense that PO Vantress was attempting to protect the

driver from § 87(2)(b) by standing in between them and by telling him to calm down. § 87(2)(b) did not see an officer take any physical actions to calm down § 87(2)(b). § 87(2)(b) noted that she would have been scared had she been in the driver's position. § 87(2)(b) another witness to the vehicle accident, also provided a statement that was generally consistent to § 87(2)(b) statement. Both individuals left the scene before the arrests. Neither § 87(2)(b) nor § 87(2)(b) noticed any other individuals with § 87(2)(b) or interacting with the officers. Neither § 87(2)(b) nor § 87(2)(b) mentioned observing a second individual at the location interacting with the officers (BR 08, 09).

PO Vantress testified that he observed § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) approaching him and § 87(2)(b) rapidly and both were yelling, "Where's the driver," loudly and aggressively, which prompted § 87(2)(b) to get back into his vehicle. PO Vantress denied taking any physical actions against § 87(2)(b) or § 87(2)(b) when they first approached; he only stood in front of them to prevent them from reaching the driver because he believed they wanted to fight the driver. PO Vantress spoke to the males, told them they could not behave in that manner, and commanded them to get on the sidewalk. § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) had not yet identified themselves as family members of the victims. § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) then began to "curse [him] out," after which PO Vantress commanded them two more times to get on the sidewalk. § 87(2)(b) then explained that he was either the father or uncle of one of the victims and asked which ambulance "the girl was in." PO Vantress told him that he did not know. § 87(2)(b) then went over to one of the ambulances and went inside, where he continued "being confrontational with EMS." PO Vantress did not prevent § 87(2)(b) from entering because he had identified himself as a family member. § 87(2)(b) was "giving EMS problems" by cursing and yelling at them to the point that they could not do their job. § 87(2)(b) who was next to PO Vantress, continued being verbally confrontational, but did not attempt to enter any of the ambulances. PO Vantress told § 87(2)(b) "Listen, you have to get on the sidewalk," to which § 87(2)(b) responded, "Fuck you, you fat fucking pig. Fuck you. I'm not doing anything. You can't tell me what to do." PO Vantress then stated, "I'm no longer asking you. I'm telling you. You need to get on the sidewalk." PO Vantress commanded § 87(2)(b) to get on the sidewalk "at least a dozen times." § 87(2)(b) refused again, after which PO Vantress grabbed § 87(2)(b) by the arms and attempted to move him to the sidewalk, but § 87(2)(b) "ripped his arms out" and started yelling, "Don't fucking touch me. You can't put your hands on me." PO Vantress then put one hand on § 87(2)(b)'s chest and attempted to push him towards the sidewalk, but § 87(2)(b) continued to resist being moved, at which point PO Vantress commanded § 87(2)(b) to place his hands behind his back because he was being placed under arrest. PO Vantress stated that § 87(2)(b) was considered under arrest for obstructing governmental administration and for disorderly conduct. PO Vantress denied that he physically interacted with § 87(2)(b).

§ 87(2)(g)

PO Lorusso stated that § 87(2)(b) also attempted to get into the ambulance, after which the officers commanded him to get on the sidewalk. § 87(2)(b) did not comply and also attempted to physically move PO Lorusso and PO Vantress so that he could get to the ambulance, after which he was told he would be arrested if he did not go to the sidewalk. PO Lorusso denied that he or PO Vantress physically interacted with § 87(2)(b).

Force may be used when it is reasonable to ensure the safety of a member of the service or a third person, or otherwise protect life, or when it is reasonable to place a person in custody or to

prevent escape from custody. In all circumstances, any application or use of force must be reasonable under the circumstances. NYPD Patrol Guide, Section 221-01 (BR 10).

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation D – Discourtesy: Police Officer Matthew Vantress spoke discourteously to

§ 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) stated that after PO Vantress attempted to physically get him on the sidewalk, he told him to “get the fuck on the sidewalk,” to “shut the fuck up,” and to put his “fucking hands” behind his back. § 87(2)(b) also alleged that PO Vantress stated, “Did you hear what

I fucking said” and called him a “motherfucker” during the incident. § 87(2)(b) did not mention that PO Vantress spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b).

Both § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) remained on scene for no more than five minutes after the § 87(2)(b) brothers arrived. During that time, they did not hear any officers curse. § 87(2)(b) did not mention the use of any profanity by any officer during his phone statement.

PO Vantress denied using any profanity towards § 87(2)(b) during the incident. All of the other officers interviewed for this case denied that PO Vantress spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b).

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation E – Force: Police Officer Jonathan Perez used physical force against § 87(2)(b)

Allegation F – Force: Police Officer Michael Laborde used physical force against § 87(2)(b)

Allegation G – Force: Police Officer Matthew Vantress used a Taser against § 87(2)(b)

Allegation H – Force: Police Officer Matthew Vantress used a Taser against § 87(2)(b)

It is undisputed that § 87(2)(b) did not comply with the officers’ requests to put his hands behind his back and that he held his hands up until the point that he was tasered.

§ 87(2)(b) stated that PO Vantress requested backup over the radio and removed his Taser after he failed to put his hands behind his back. PO Vantress also threatened to use the Taser against § 87(2)(b). After a few minutes, four to six officers arrived to the location, some of whom assisted PO Vantress in trying to handcuff § 87(2)(b). PO Perez grabbed § 87(2)(b) and “yanked” his body towards the ground. § 87(2)(b) was unable to describe any other physical force used by the officers because he felt “many hands” on him. § 87(2)(b) was then pushed to the ground, landing face down. While on the ground, § 87(2)(b) felt like the officers were “trying to get [his] hands behind his back” and he felt “a lot of hands and hits and what not.” § 87(2)(b) was then struck by the Taser in his back two times. When asked to clarify what he meant by “hits,” § 87(2)(b) stated that he was not sure if he was being punched or if it was the effect of the Taser. § 87(2)(b) could not estimate how much time elapsed between the moment he was taken to the ground and the moment the Taser was used, but he stated that it occurred soon after. § 87(2)(b) stated “not much time” passed between the first discharge of the Taser and the second. PO Vantress did not issue § 87(2)(b) any warnings about the Taser immediately preceding its use. § 87(2)(b) stated that he was unsure of the exact sequence of events while he was on the ground and whether officers had one hand in handcuffs when he was tasered, or whether he was tasered a second time and then handcuffed.

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b) stated that § 87(2)(b) started to move towards the sidewalk, but PO Vantress then removed his Taser and stated, “Do you want to be tased?” At the sight of the Taser, § 87(2)(b) “jumped out” of the ambulance and stated, “What are you tasing him for?” PO Vantress told § 87(2)(b) to move to the sidewalk, at which point § 87(2)(b) started recording. When asked what physical actions the additional officers took against § 87(2)(b) when attempting to handcuff him, § 87(2)(b) could only state that the officers were grabbing § 87(2)(b) twisting his arm back, and attempting to push him to

the ground. § 87(2)(b) stated that his brother kept his hands up during this time but did not do anything else. The officers managed to bend § 87(2)(b) over, but were not able to get him to the ground. PO Vantress, who at this point was still holding onto § 87(2)(b) released him, stepped back, and used his Taser against § 87(2)(b) striking him in his back. § 87(2)(b) believed that PO Vantress “shocked” § 87(2)(b) twice. § 87(2)(b) estimated that less than five seconds passed between the first discharge of the Taser and the second. § 87(2)(b) then went to the ground and was placed in handcuffs.

PO Vantress stated that § 87(2)(b) actively resisted arrest by refusing to “give up” his arms and by not allowing PO Vantress and PO Lorusso to put him in handcuffs. PO Vantress then called for additional units. During this time, § 87(2)(b) exited the ambulance and began recording PO Vantress and PO Lorusso’s struggle with § 87(2)(b) but § 87(2)(b) got too close to PO Vantress and PO Lorusso, so PO Vantress removed his Taser and gave § 87(2)(b) a “red dot warning” and told him that he needed to back up. PO Vantress added that he removed his Taser because of safety concerns because he and PO Lorusso were the only officers at the scene at the time, they were currently engaged with § 87(2)(b) and because § 87(2)(b) was “aggressively coming too close” to them and was being “verbally abusive.” During this time, a crowd of five to ten people had gathered on the sidewalk and they were making noise and “yelling things,” but he was not sure what they were saying. Shortly after, PO Perez and PO Laborde responded to the scene and assisted in trying to handcuff § 87(2)(b) by grabbing his arms and trying to place them behind his back, but § 87(2)(b) continued to resist by refusing to give up his arms. PO Vantress then proceeded to deploy his Taser against § 87(2)(b) PO Vantress was approximately three feet away from § 87(2)(b) Immediately after deploying the Taser, § 87(2)(b) “collapsed” to the ground, and the Taser cycled for five seconds. After the first cycle stopped, § 87(2)(b) continued to resist while on the ground by moving around and by putting his hands underneath his body, thereby not allowing officers to handcuff him. PO Vantress cycled the Taser a second time, after which § 87(2)(b) put his hands behind his back and allowed himself to be handcuffed. PO Vantress estimated that ten seconds passed between the first cycle and the second cycle. PO Vantress noted that, prior to utilizing the Taser, he warned § 87(2)(b) to stop resisting or he would use the Taser. At no point did § 87(2)(b) verbalize that he would comply, or take any physical actions to indicate that he would comply prior to the use of the Taser.

§ 87(2)(g)

After additional officers arrived, PO Vantress and the officers struggled with § 87(2)(b) for 30 seconds to one minute before the Taser was used, after which § 87(2)(b) was able to be handcuffed. PO Lorusso also stated that § 87(2)(b) did not resist while on the ground. PO Lorusso did not know if more than one cycle was used.

§ 87(2)(g)

PO Perez explained that officers were trying to maneuver § 87(2)(b) s arms to put them behind his back, but he kept tensing his arms in front of his body to prevent himself from being handcuffed. After PO Vantress used the Taser against § 87(2)(b) and while he was on the ground, § 87(2)(b) continued to resist by refusing to put his arms behind his back. PO Perez did not recall § 87(2)(b) taking any other physical actions while on the ground, besides refusing to give up his arms. PO Perez did not take any other physical actions besides grabbing § 87(2)(b) s arms during the handcuffing process. PO Perez did not know whether more than one cycle was used. PO Laborde denied that he had any physical contact with

§ 87(2)(b) but was generally consistent with the other officers' statements regarding § 87(2)(b)'s resistance. Sgt. Hom did not witness § 87(2)(b)'s entire arrest because he placed § 87(2)(b) in handcuffs, but his description of § 87(2)(b)'s resistance upon arrival was generally consistent with the other officers' statements. All of the officers denied that § 87(2)(b) was punched or struck in his back.

The video provided by § 87(2)(b) and captured by § 87(2)(b) seems to capture two distinct moments, but it is only one file. The first part shows PO Vantress with his Taser out while he is holding onto § 87(2)(b) who is against a vehicle. § 87(2)(b) at one point, approaches PO Vantress and is then commanded to "back up." § 87(2)(b) is cursing loudly at PO Vantress, during which he calls him a "fat fuck," and several other profanities.



201704633_20180108_1251_DM.mp4

Snag video 1

The second part of the video is 13 seconds long and captures § 87(2)(b) over the hood of a parked vehicle with his left arm extended in front of him, which PO Perez then grabs and attempts to place behind his back. PO Perez is being assisted by one or two additional officers; however, it appears that they are struggling to place his hands behind his back because § 87(2)(b) is not giving up his arms. The video does not capture PO Vantress's use of the Taser.



201704633_20180108_1253_DM.mp4

Snag video 2

An officer must use only the reasonable force necessary to gain control or custody of a subject. NYPD Patrol Guide, Section 221-01 (BR 10). A Taser, which is classified as a less lethal device and is intended to augment and provide a greater margin of safety for officers who might otherwise be forced to physically subdue a dangerous subject, should only be used against persons who are actively resisting, exhibiting active aggression, or to prevent individuals from physically injuring themselves or other person. Active resisting includes physically evasive movements to defeat a member of the service's attempt to control, including bracing, tensing, pushing, or verbally signaling an intention to avoid or prevent being taken into custody. NYPD Patrol Guide, Section 221-08 (BR 11).

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)
[REDACTED]

§ 87(2)(g)
[REDACTED]

Allegation I – Force: Police Officer Jonathan Perez used physical force against § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) alleged that after he was placed in handcuffs, he was made to stay on the ground for a minute or two, during which PO Perez held him down by putting his foot against his back and pressing down. § 87(2)(b) alleged that PO Perez applied pressure to § 87(2)(b)'s back for a few seconds by putting his foot on top of him and stated, “You like that?”

PO Perez noted that § 87(2)(b) had not been searched immediately after he was placed in handcuffs and that he continued to move and continued “squirmishing,” so PO Perez placed his foot near § 87(2)(b)'s wrist to keep him under control because he did not know whether § 87(2)(b) would attempt to go into his pockets and possibly remove a weapon, or whether he would “roll over to try and kick [them] or whatever.” PO Perez did not recall observing any visible bulges or anything indicative of a weapon on § 87(2)(b)'s person. PO Perez stated that he performed said action to gain control of § 87(2)(b) and to observe the crowd “because [they] were getting surrounded by the crowd” and he wanted to make sure the crowd would not attack them. When asked if he placed his foot on § 87(2)(b)'s handcuffs, PO Perez stated, “I don’t know exactly where I was stepping on, but it was where his handcuffs were and where his hands were, so it was just like, I don’t know exactly where it was, but it was in that area of his lower back, just to make sure that he wasn’t going to continue to reach for anything.” § 87(2)(b) became upset by PO Perez’s action and stated, “Get off my fucking wrist.” PO Perez kept his foot on § 87(2)(b) until he believed that “everything was safe” and that the crowd was under control. PO Perez estimated that there were 10 to 15 people in the crowd, but none attempted to get involved with the incident. The crowd remained on the sidewalk and yelled at officers. PO Perez did not know specifically what the crowd was yelling. PO Perez then raised

§ 87(2)(b) off the ground and placed him inside an RMP. PO Perez did not recall § 87(2)(b) indicating that he was in pain due to PO Perez's action. All of the other officers interviewed for this case denied observing an officer put their foot on top of § 87(2)(b) while on the ground, and they did not note that § 87(2)(b) was physically resistant after he was handcuffed or that they feared that he might have had a weapon. The officers also indicated that a large crowd had gathered, but none indicated that they feared for their safety because of the crowd.

An officer must use only the reasonable force necessary to gain control or custody of a subject. NYPD Patrol Guide, Section 221-01 (BR 10).

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)

Mediation, Civil and Criminal Histories

- This case was unsuitable for mediation due to § 87(2)(b)'s and § 87(2)(b)'s arrests and subsequent open criminal cases.
- As of October 25, 2017, § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) have not filed a Notice of Claim against the City of New York (BR 03).

• [§ 87(2)(b)] [§§ 86(1)(3)&(4)] [§ 87(2)(c)]

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- This is § 87(2)(b)'s first complaint (BR 05).
- This is § 87(2)(b)'s first CCRB complaint, though he was listed as a witness in CCRB § 87(2)(b) (BR 06).

- PO Vantress has been a member of the NYPD for nine years. He has been the subject of one previous allegation, which was exonerated.
- PO Lorusso has been a member of the NYPD for one year. This is his first CCRB complaint.
- PO Perez has been a member of the NYPD for six years. He has been the subject of four previous allegations stemming from one complaint with one substantiated allegation § 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b) [REDACTED] In CCRB 20109267, a property damage allegation was substantiated, for which he received instructions.
- PO Laborde has been a member of the NYPD for four years. He has been the subject of ten previous allegations stemming from two cases, none of which were substantiated. § 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b) [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
- § 87(2)(g) [REDACTED]

Squad: _____

Investigator: _____
Signature Print Date

Squad Leader: _____
Title/Signature Print Date

Reviewer: _____
Title/Signature Print Date